IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 11TH APRIL 2007 / 21ST CHAITHRA 1929

WP(C).No. 34547 of 2006(K)

PETITIONER:

JOSEPH A.A.,
ATHIYUNDAL BAHAVAN,
TRIKKUR P.O.,
THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.P.G.SURESH
SRI.C.V.MANUVILSAN

RESPONDENTS:

1. KERALA STATE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
PATTOM,THIRUVANANTHAPURM.

2. THE DISTRICT OFFICER,
KERALA STATE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
DISTRICT OFFICE,
THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, KPSC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11/04/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

==========

W.P.(C).No.34547 of 2006

==========

Dated this the 11th day of April, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner appeared for the written test conducted by the Kerala Public Service Commission (PSC) for the post of Reserve Watcher in the Forest Department, on 3.4.2004. His name did not find a place in the short list prepared by the PSC. He applied for revaluation of the answer sheet. However, the petitioner's request was rejected on the ground that the application has been filed out of time. The petitioner seeks a direction to the PSC to consider and pass orders on Ext.P5 representation.

2. The Public Service Commission has filed a counter affidavit in which they have categorically stated that there is no provision for revaluation of the answer sheets of the written tests conducted by the PSC, but rechecking of answer scripts is

permitted, provided the candidate applies within 30 days from the date on which the notification is finally released by the PSC. According to them, in this case, the final list itself was published on 15.1.2005, not to mention about the result of the written test, which was published as early as on 20.9.2004. The petitioner's application was sent only on 1.7.2006 and therefore, the same is far beyond the period prescribed under the Rules. In view of the said categoric statement in the counter affidavit, I do not think that any purpose would be served by directing the PSC to consider Ext.P5 representation filed by the petitioner. In the above circumstances, I do not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

sdk+ S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE